REMARKS

Applicant has carefully considered the Examiner's outstanding Office Action, and, as explained below all of the pending claims are allowable over the prior art of record alone or in combination.

Embodiments of the invention, among other features, display asymmetrical indications, such as vectors, which graphically indicate direction of fire movement in addition to the fact that the same display represents the current or instantaneous condition based on the received information. First responders are able to immediately visualize without any conjecture or estimation on their part the direction in which the fire is developing. In this regard the Examiner is directed to exemplary embodiments of Figs. 3-3, and 4-2. Also, as illustrated in Fig. 4-2 embodiments of the invention can project indicia indicative of future fire direction and development.

As explained above, the ability of first responders to quickly look at a display and get immediate feedback as to direction of fire development as it is currently ongoing, an estimation of future fire development, as well as velocity of the moving fire can help direct them in this region of interest.

Unlike the claimed invention, Kimmel et al. discloses merely the use of point sources, indicative of sensors in alarm, see Fig. 1 thereof namely sensors 106, 108. Alternately, see latched sensors 114, 160. Particularly the latched sensors 114, 160 do not necessarily indicate current fire direction due to the fact that they may have gone into a latched state at some point in the past. The instantaneous display of Fig. 1 of Kimmel et al. provides no time dependent information whatsoever. Sensors 106, 108 do not indicate in and of themselves any directional information. For example, the entire floor shown in Fig. 1 of Kimmel et al. could be involved in the fire which would explain why both sensors 106 and 108 were in alarm. This tells nothing about direction of fire movement to a first responder or anyone else looking at Fig. 1 of Kimmel et al.

Similar comments apply to the portion of Kimmel et al. (Col. 4, ll. 41-44 cited by the Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action, ll. 5 and 6 from the bottom of the page namely:

"The latch conditions 114 and 116 represent motion detectors in the same state as latch condition 112; these conditions inform the user of two separate tracks (i.e., paths) of an intruder (or spread of a fire);"

At least for the above reasons Kimmel et al. fails to anticipate any of the pending claims. Further, Brogi et al. cited by the Examiner in connection with the rejection of claim 20 fails to address any of the above noted deficiencies of Kimmel et al. Brogi et al. is silent as to displayed images and adds nothing to teachings of Kimmel et al. in that regard.

Thus for at least the above reasons the pending claims which have been rejected are allowable. Claim 6 has been rewritten in independent form so as to obviate the rejections of claims 6-13 and those claims should now be allowable as well. Newly added claims are also allowable. Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: December 4, 2006

By _____

Paul M. Vargo
Reg. No. 29,116
WELSH & KATZ, LTD.
120 South Riverside Plaza, 22nd Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Phone: (312) 655-1500
Fax: (312) 655-1501